

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

2005 FEB 17 P 12:15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

05

10330 NMG

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.

RICHARD E. KAPLAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIRST HARTFORD CORPORATION,

Defendant.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MABCIVIL Action No. 10330RECEIPT # 62911AMOUNT \$250SUMMONS ISSUED 1/18/05LOCAL RULE 4.1 1WAIVER FORM 1MCF ISSUED 1BY DPTY. CLK KWDATE 2/11/05**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL****Nature of the Action**

This is a shareholder action brought against defendant First Hartford Corporation (“First Hartford” or the “Company”). This action arises out of the Company’s proxy solicitation in connection with its Annual Meeting of Shareholders called for February 24, 2005. The proxy solicitation materials disseminated by the Company contained false or misleading statements of material fact and omitted to state other material facts necessary to make the materials not false or misleading. In disseminating the false or misleading proxy solicitation materials, the Company engaged in fraudulent, deceptive and/or manipulative acts or practices in violation of the federal securities laws.

Parties

1. The Plaintiff, Richard E. Kaplan, is an individual residing in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is and was at all relevant times a shareholder of First Hartford, owning of record and beneficially more than 100,000 shares of the outstanding shares of the Company’s

common stock. As a shareholder, Mr. Kaplan has the right to vote his shares at the Company's meetings for which shareholders are provided complete, accurate, and truthful information.

2. Defendant First Hartford is a Maine corporation with a principal place of business in Manchester, Connecticut. First Hartford is in the business of purchasing, developing, owning, managing, and selling real estate. First Hartford has more than 3,000,000 shares of common stock issued and outstanding.

Jurisdiction and Venue

3. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(a) and 15 U.S.C. § 78aa.

4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78aa and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because the acts or transactions constituting the violations of law giving rise to these claims occurred in this District.

Facts

5. First Hartford's common stock is registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The shares of First Hartford trade over the "pink sheets," but are very thinly traded. There is no analyst coverage of the Company.

6. First Hartford is controlled by Neil H. Ellis ("Ellis"), who owns beneficially 42.9% of its outstanding shares, and serves as President and a director.

7. On or about January 31, 2005, First Hartford sent to certain First Hartford shareholders written notice (the "Notice") of an Annual Meeting of Shareholders to be held on February 24, 2005 (the "February 2005 Meeting"). Accompanying the Notice were certain proxy solicitation materials (the "Proxy Materials"). The Proxy Materials are the subject of this Complaint.

8. The Proxy Materials that First Hartford sent to shareholders along with the Notice of the February 2005 Meeting set forth two purposes for the meeting:

- (a) to elect directors; and
- (b) to consider and act on a proposal from Plaintiff that would require 80% of the Board of Directors to be independent.

9. The Proxy Materials provided to shareholders were materially false and misleading in several respects, as detailed below.

10. The Proxy Materials, under the heading "Audit Committee Report," state: "First Hartford does not have an audit committee and accordingly its entire Board of Directors fulfills the functions of an audit committee." This is false and misleading. The First Hartford Board of Directors may act as the audit committee, but it is false and misleading to tell shareholders that it fulfills the functions of an audit committee. The primary function of an audit committee is to assure that the independent auditors are properly auditing the financial records prepared by management. In the case of First Hartford, the Board is made up entirely of the management (CEO, treasurer and vice president) who are responsible for the financial statements that the auditors are supposed to be auditing. As such, they are in no position to oversee the auditors. In fact, in the case of First Hartford, the functions of an audit committee are not fulfilled at all. A reasonable stockholder would find such information material in considering whether to elect a board with no outside directors, and whether to approve the proposal to require the inclusion of independent directors on the Board.

11. The Proxy Materials, under the heading "Compensation Committee Report," state: "First Hartford does not have a compensation committee and accordingly its entire Board of Directors fulfills the role of compensation committee." This is false and misleading. The

First Hartford Board of Directors does not even pretend to fulfill the role of a compensation committee. Instead, Ellis alone sets his own compensation and that of the other executive officers.

12. The "Five-Year Performance Graph: 1998-2003," included in the Proxy Materials, purports to show that over the past five years First Hartford has been a good investment for stockholders and misleadingly suggests the prices at which a shareholder could have sold his or her First Hartford shares at various times during the period. This graph is false and misleading, and a reasonable investor would find this information material in deciding whether to elect the directors and how to vote on the proposal to include independent directors on the Board. In fact, there is almost no market for First Hartford stock, and it is very unlikely that a shareholder desiring to sell more than a token number of shares would be able to do so at the prices on the graph.

13. The Proxy Materials are incomplete and misleading because they fail to disclose sufficient information about self-dealing transactions between Ellis and First Hartford. The section entitled "Certain Relationships and Related Transactions" on pages 9-10 of the Proxy Materials and the statement on page 14 that "Mr. Ellis received no remuneration for giving these guarantees" would lead a reasonable shareholder to believe that Mr. Ellis has gratuitously guaranteed various loans, and that any loans from Ellis or his entities to First Hartford are without interest, or are the same as the terms of a related loan from a bank to Ellis. This is false and misleading. **Plaintiff intends to include here an example of a failure to disclose information about self-dealing transactions between Neil Ellis and First Hartford that is based upon certain information Plaintiff has discovered in the case styled Richard E. Kaplan v. First Hartford Corporation (D. Mass. C.A. No. 04-10402-NMG). This**

information has been designated "Confidential" in that case by First Hartford and is subject to the provisions of a protective order. Plaintiff has, consistent with that protective order, notified First Hartford of its desire to include the information designated "Confidential" by First Hartford in this Complaint. Plaintiff is awaiting a response from First Hartford or the court's ruling on any motion for impoundment that First Hartford may file before including the information in this Complaint or an Amended Complaint. The Proxy Materials are also misleading in omitting to disclose to shareholders that First Hartford does not maintain documentation of the terms of most of the self-dealing transactions between First Hartford and Ellis and his related entities. Such information would be considered material by a reasonable stockholder in determining whether to re-elect Ellis (and directors dominated by Ellis) or whether to approve a requirement for independent directors on the Board.

14. On page 14 of the Proxy Materials, in opposition to the proposal for independent directors on the Board, management states: "The Board of Directors takes action on matters that each director believes to be, in the exercise of his fiduciary responsibilities, in the best interest of First Hartford as a whole, and *all* of its shareholders." This statement is false and misleading. The Board rarely meets, and has a long record of permitting, without meetings, actions to benefit themselves at the expense of First Hartford and its other shareholders.

15. The deceptive and misleading Proxy Materials were mailed to and received by the Plaintiff in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

COUNT I

(Violation of Section 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78n(e) --
Deceptive And Inadequate Disclosure In Proxy Solicitation)

16. The Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

17. The Defendant First Hartford solicited proxies through materials containing false or misleading statements or omissions that a reasonable stockholder would consider material in deciding how to vote.

18. First Hartford's false, misleading, and deceptive Proxy Materials caused injury to the Plaintiff and wrongfully interfered with his rights as a shareholder to receive complete, truthful, and accurate information in connection with his vote and with his rights as a shareholder to have other shareholders provided with complete, truthful and accurate information in connection with their votes.

19. As a result of First Hartford's wrongful conduct, Plaintiff has been irreparably harmed.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands judgment as follows:

- (a) Voiding the shareholder votes taken at the February 2005 Meeting and any actions taken pursuant thereto;
- (b) Ordering that a new shareholder meeting be called, with appropriate notice and pursuant to proxy materials which remedy the defects identified herein and which are complete, accurate, truthful and not misleading;
- (c) Awarding to the Plaintiff the costs and expenses of this action, including attorneys' fees; and
- (d) All such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

The Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

RICHARD E. KAPLAN,
Plaintiff,

By his attorneys,



Larry C. Kenna (BBO No. 267760)
Robert Rothberg (BBO No. 430980)
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 248-5000

Dated: February 17, 2005

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS1. Title of case (name of first party on each side only) Richard E. Kaplan v. First Hartford Corporation

2. Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).



I. 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.



II. 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.



III. 110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.



IV. 220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.



V. 150, 152, 153.

2005 FEB 11 P 12: 15

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.
*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121
for patent, trademark or copyright cases

05-10330 NMG

3. Title and number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this district please indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.

Richard E. Kaplan v. First Hartford Corporation (C.A. No. 04-10402-NMG)

4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?

YES NO

5. Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403)

YES NO

If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?

YES NO

6. Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?

YES NO 7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)).YES NO A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?Eastern Division Central Division Western Division

B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?

Eastern Division Central Division Western Division

8. If filing a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions)

YES NO

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT)

ATTORNEY'S NAME LARRY C. KENNANADDRESS CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP, 53 STATE ST., BOSTON, MA 02109TELEPHONE NO. (617) 248-2113

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Richard E. Kaplan

(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF Middlesex
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)

Larry C. Kenner
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109 (617) 248-2113

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION

(PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff

3 Federal Question
(U.S. Government Not a Party)

2 U.S. Government Defendant

4 Diversity
(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)

| | PTF | DEF | PTF | DEF | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

| CONTRACT | TORTS | FORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury — Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury — Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability | <input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other | <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 |
| REAL PROPERTY | CIVIL RIGHTS | PRISONER PETITIONS | PROPERTY RIGHTS | <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property | <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence HABEAS CORPUS: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition | <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act | <input type="checkbox"/> 661 HIA (1395ft) <input type="checkbox"/> 662 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 663 DIFC/DIVW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 664 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 665 RSI (405(g)) |
| | | | FEDERAL TAX SUITS | <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609 |

V. ORIGIN

(PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

1 Original Proceeding

2 Removed from State Court

3 Remanded from Appellate Court

4 Reinstated or Reopened

Transferred from
 5 another district (specify)

6 Multidistrict Litigation

Appeal to District Judge from
 7 Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

(CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY.)

Violations of §14(e) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §78n(e)

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION
 UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND:

YES
 NO

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions):

JUDGE

Nathaniel M. Gorton

DOCKET NUMBER

04-10402-NMG

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

February 17, 2005

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY